CONNECTICUT

LAW

JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXXI No. 20

November 12, 2019

173 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Saint Paul (Order), 333 C 935	47 48 47 46 45 48 45 44 44 45 2
333 C 934	46 49
CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS	
A.C. Consulting, LLC v. Alexion Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 194 CA 316	74A
Ciccarelli v. Ciccarelli, 194 CA 335	93A 97A
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court improperly denied amended petition for writ of habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance; whether	J.11

(continued on next page)

habeas court properly concluded that petitioner failed to sustain his burden of proving that he was prejudiced by trial counsel's alleged deficient performance; whether it was reasonably probable that, but for trial counsel's alleged deficient legal advice, petitioner would have accepted state's thirty-five year plea deal; claim that habeas court's finding that petitioner would have rejected plea deal even if he had received accurate advice from trial counsel concerning admissibility of certain testimony was clearly erroneous; whether petitioner's testimony that he would have accepted plea deal was unreliable; whether claim that prior habeas counsel rendered ineffective assistance failed as matter of law.

State v. DeJesus, 194 CA 304.

Sexual assault in fourth degree; risk of injury to child; unpreserved claim that trial court improperly admitted into evidence expert testimony regarding how child victims of sexual abuse behave and how they disclose their abuse; whether trial court committed plain error in admitting testimony of expert witness; request that this court exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice to preclude, as matter of law, admission of expert testimony on characteristics of children who report sexual abuse; claim that trial court abused its discretion during pretrial hearing by refusing to permit defendant to ask victim leading questions on direct examination; whether defendant failed to establish that trial

court's alleged error caused him harm.

State v. Patel, 194 CA 245 Murder; home invasion; burglary in first degree as accessory; robbery in first degree as accessory; conspiracy to commit burglary in first degree; tampering with physical evidence; whether trial court abused its discretion when it admitted coconspirator's statements pursuant to dual inculpatory statement exception to hearsay rule in applicable provision (§ 8-6 [4]) of Connecticut Code of Evidence; unpreserved claim that trial court improperly found coconspirator unavailable to testify; claim that defendant's sixth amendment right to confrontation was violated when trial court failed to have coconspirator sworn in prior to making its determination that coconspirator was unavailable to testify; claim that trial court committed $plain\ error\ when\ it\ failed\ to\ have\ coconspirator\ sworn\ in\ before\ making\ its\ determination and the plain\ error\ when\ it\ failed\ to\ have\ coconspirator\ sworn\ in\ before\ making\ its\ determination\ determination\$ nation that coconspirator was unavailable to testify; claim that trial court violated defendant's sixth amendment right to confrontation when it admitted tape recording of coconspirator's statements to jailhouse informant; claim that coconspirator's statements to jailhouse informant constituted inadmissible testimonial hearsay under federal constitution; unpreserved claim that coconspirator's statements to jailhouse informant were testimonial under due process and confrontation clauses in article first, § 8, of state constitution; claim that trial court abused its discretion when it admitted coconspirator's statements to jailhouse informant

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

and coconspirator's girlfriend pursuant to § 8-6 (4); whether trial court properly

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications Office of Production and Distribution 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178 www.jud.ct.gov

Richard J. Hemenway, $Publications\ Director$

 $Published \ Weekly-Available \ at \ \underline{\text{https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal}}$

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by Eric M. Levine, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions* Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

59A

62A

3A

found that coconspirator's statements to jailhouse informant and coconspirator's girlfriend presented sufficient indicia of reliability; whether trial court abused its discretion when it excluded from evidence under § 8-6 (4) certain testimony as not trustworthy; whether trial court abused its discretion when it denied defendant's motion to preclude state from offering testimony about cell phone tower data analysis; claim that trial court failed to conduct hearing pursuant to State v. Porter (241 Conn. 57) to determine reliability of methods and procedures concerning cell phone tower data analysis; whether evidence was sufficient to convict defendant of murder under theory of liability that was predicated on Pinkerton v. United States (328 U.S. 640).	111A
MISCELLANEOUS	
Notice of Inactive Status	1B